

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as currently amended and in view of the following remarks, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-7 and 18 are currently active in this case. Claims 1-7 and 18 have been amended and Claims 11-17 and 20 have been canceled. No new matter has been added.

In the outstanding Office Action, claims 1-7, 11-18, and 20 were rejected on the grounds of non-statutory obviousness type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-8 of US Patent No. 6,721,811; claims 1-7, 11-18, and 20 were rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement; claims 1-7, 11-18, and 20 were rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite; claims 2, 3, 12, and 13 were rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite; claims 6 and 16 were rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite; and Claims 1-17, 11-18, and 20 were rejected under 38 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oberhaus et al. (US Patent No. 6,983,308) and alternatively over Oberhaus in view of Woo et al. (US Patent No. 5,948,059).

In response to the obviousness typed double patenting rejection, Applicants have submitted herewith a Terminal Disclaimer to overcome the rejection.

In response to the rejection of claims 1-7, 11-18, and 20 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, for failing the enablement requirement, Applicants have amended claim 1 to remove the registration unit feature. Consequently, no further rejection under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, is anticipated.

The “means for transmitting” recitation of claim 1 has been amended to read “a message transmission unit.” Thus, 35 USC 112, sixth paragraph, is no longer being invoked with regard to that feature. With regard to the “means for recognizing” and “means for determining” features recited in claim 11-17 and 20, those claims have been cancelled.

Consequently, the 35 USC 112, second paragraph, rejection with regard to those features is moot.

With regard to the 35 USC, 112, second paragraph, rejection of claims 2, 3, 12, and 13, Applicants have amended claim 2 to clarify that the portable message processing device further comprises a unit configured to store the messages, collected by the message collection unit, and stored in the first memory. Claim 12 has been cancelled. Consequently, no further rejection of claims 2, 3, 12, and 13 under 35 USC, 112, second paragraph, is anticipated.

With regard to claims 6 and 16, Applicants point out that the Office Action's interpretation of the notification unit is correct. Consequently, no further rejection of these claims under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, is anticipated.

Briefly recapitulating, the present invention (claim 1 as amended) is directed to a portable message processing device which can be connected to different networks at different times. The device includes a recognition unit configured to recognize a particular network to which the portable message processing device is currently connected; a determination unit configured to determine communication methods for accessing a plurality of message servers distributed on a plurality of networks; a memory configured to store messages in the portable message processing device; a message collection unit configured to collect messages addressed to the user from the message servers, using the communication methods determined by the determination unit, and to store the messages into the memory; and a message transmission unit configured to transmit the messages stored in the memory, in response to a request for viewing the messages from another device connected to the particular network.

As a consequence of this configuration and in particular the message collection unit, the apparatus collects messages regardless of where or how the messages are generated or read, and realizes a centralized management system for messages delivered from a plurality

of message servers on various networks to a user of the portable message processing device.

See page 6, line 10 to page 8, line 13 of the Specification.

Additionally, according to the present invention, all messages destined to the user are received from the message servers and stored in the portable message processing device. Then, the user can take the portable message processing device on the go and still retrieve messages. When the user wants to read the messages, the portable message processing device connects to a network available at the user's location, and the messages are transferred from the portable message processing device to another device for viewing the messages. In this way, the user can manage the messages in a unified way, and read them anywhere, using any viewing device that is available at the location of the user. That is, the present invention provides a portable message processing device configured to be portable and to provide a unified manner of handling and managing e-mails of a given user (see page 2, lines 22-26 of the Specification).

In contrast thereto, Oberhaus merely discloses a system for synchronizing different electronic mail mailboxes of a user, such as one for a hand-held computing device and another for a desk-top computer (see col. 1, lines 35-41). In other words, in Oberhaus, the various mailboxes exist on different devices and receive electronic messages independently, and then the electronic messages stored on the various mailboxes on different devices are synchronized. Consequently, Oberhaus fails to teach or suggest the message collection feature of the present invention. Thus, the system of Oberhaus cannot realize a centralized management for messages delivered from a plurality of information servers and configured to be portable and to provide a unified way of handling and managing e-mails of a given user.

Further, the Official Action concedes on page 9 that Oberhaus fails to disclose the claimed determination unit configured to determine communication methods for accessing the message servers, or the claimed message collection unit. Applicants agree. However, the

Official Action further asserts that these features are disclosed by Woo. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Woo merely discloses a system involving an e-mail server and a voice-mail server on a shared network. Consequently, Woo fails to teach or suggest determining communication methods for accessing a plurality of message servers distributed on a *plurality of networks*, and collecting messages addressed to the user from these message servers distributed on the plurality of networks. Consequently, Woo does not address the deficiencies of Oberhaus. Thus, Oberhaus is not believed to anticipate or render obvious the subject matter defined by claims 1-7 and 18 when considered alone or in combination with Woo.

In view of the foregoing, no further issues are believed to remain and an early and favorable action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Eckhard H. Kuesters
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 28,870

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

W. Todd Baker
Registration No. 45,265